

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 and 3-23 are pending in the application. The Examiner has indicated that claims 1, 3-7 and 17-23 are allowed, subject to removal of objections to claims 1, 6-8, 13, 17, 20 and 23. Claims 8-16 have been rejected. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

The Claim Objections

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 6-8, 13, 17, 20 and 23 indicating her objection to applicant's use of the term "for". While applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion regarding such use, applicant has amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant submits that the objections to the claims have been overcome.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. §§ 103

The Cited Prior Art Does Not Render the Claimed Invention Obvious

As set forth in the MPEP:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

MPEP 2143

Claims 8-16 have been rejected as being unpatentable over McConnell in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,148,967 to Satoh et al. ("Satoh") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,206 to Schweiger et al. ("Schweiger"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Neither McConnell nor Schweiger teach or suggest a decorative member including an exposed portion having an ornamental surface that is furnished with decorative plating, and a ferromagnetic body amplifying the transponder-driving radio wave and preventing the generation of an eddy current in the decorative member; these elements are now explicitly recited in independent claims 8 and 13. The addition of Satoh provides no such teaching or suggestion. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-16 are patentable over McConnell, Schweiger and Satoh, either alone or in combination.

Applicant notes that the addition to claims 8 and 13 adds claim language that describes an inherent aspect of the ferromagnetic body; thus, the added claim language does not necessitate a new search.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

January 17, 2007

Date

/Mark D. Simpson/

Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
2600 ARAMARK Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189